UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,379	07/02/2007	Alfred Thomas	1842.040US1	8132
70648 7590 08/27/2010 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING P.O. BOX 2938 MININEA DOLLE, MN 55402			EXAMINER	
			SHAH, MILAP	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3714		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com request@slwip.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
N 42 CAL 1	10/591,379	THOMAS, ALFRED			
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner	Art Unit			
	MILAP SHAH	3714			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
This application is abandoned in view of:		•			
<ol> <li>Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office</li> <li>(a) ☐ A reply was received on (with a Certificate of N period for reply (including a total extension of time of, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not be a proper reply to the Office of N and N are placed as a proper reply to the Office of N are placed as a proper reply to the Office of N are placed as a proper reply to the Office of N are placed as a proper reply to the Office of N are placed as a proper reply to the Office of N are placed as a proper reply to the Office of N are placed as a proper reply to the Office of N are placed as a proper reply to the Office of N are placed as a proper reply was received on, but it does not placed as a proper reply was received on, but it does not placed as a proper reply was received on, but it does not placed as a proper reply was received on, but it does not placed as a proper reply was received on</li> </ol>	failing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on	<u></u> .			
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	n consists only of: (1) a timely filed ar Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); o	nendment which places the			
(c) A reply was received on but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).					
(d) 🛮 No reply has been received.					
<ul> <li>2.  Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8 (a)  The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was</li></ul>	5). received on (with a Certifica	ate of Mailing or Transmission dated			
(b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance	a of \$ is due				
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ 1		CFR 1.18(d), is \$			
(c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.					
3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as requallowability (PTO-37).  (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on					
after the expiration of the period for reply.  (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.					
(b) I No corrected drawings have been received.					
<ol> <li>The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants.</li> </ol>	e attorney or agent of record, the assi	ignee of the entire interest, or all of			
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.					
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.					
7. 🔀 The reason(s) below:					
Applicant's representative, Rodney Lacy, confirmed August 23, 2010.	abandonment of the instant appl	ication during a telephone call on			
/David L Lewis/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714					
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra	w the holding of abandonment under 37 (	CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to			